DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 382 CE 071 930

AUTHOR	Angel, P. Linda
TITLE	Measuring Customer Satisfaction. A Central Texas JTPA Study.
INSTITUTION	Central Texas Council of Governments, Belton.
PUB DATE	Aug 95
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Central Texas Council of Governments, Workforce Development Division, P.O. Box 729, Belton, TX 76513 ($10).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; Disadvantaged; *Dislocated Workers; *Employment Programs; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; *Participant Satisfaction; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Texas (Central)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the baseline by which to measure expected improvements in customer satisfaction for Central Texas Job Training Partnership (JTPA) programs. The survey was designed to facilitate assessment of the current level of customer satisfaction with service delivery and influences on customer satisfaction. Data were gathered by telephone using a 5-level, 25-question Likert scale with a population of 241 adult customers served by the JTPA offices in Temple and Killeen; 181 responses were received (75 percent). Data were analyzed using combined and individual mean scores by office and case managers; Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between offices and case managers; ranking of questions from least to most positive response by combined and individual offices; and item analysis of additional comments by subject. Results of the survey were generally positive, showing a strong level of customer satisfaction, although results varied from office to office. Recommendations made include the following: (1) use results of the survey as an administrative tool to increase levels of customer satisfaction through improved program services; (2) implement a follow-up survey in 6 months to evaluate improvements; and (3) do a correlational study comparing survey results with participant performance outcomes to determine the relationship between customer satisfaction and positive outcomes. (The survey instrument and results are included in the report.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 382

MEASURING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

a Central Texas JTPA Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Angel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Contemporary Issues in Employment & Training

Workforce Development of Central Texas
Central Texas Service Delivery Area
Post Office Box 729
Belton, Texas 76513
(817) 939-3771

CE071 935

MEASURING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

a Central Texas JTPA Study

P. Linda Angel

Workforce Development of Central Texas
Central Texas Service Delivery Area
Belton, Texas

Acknowledgement

A special thanks to Dr. Edward Mullen of the University of Central Texas Research Institute and University of Central Texas faculty and staff.

Preface

The survey science project herein described is the first of several implementation strategies for measuring and improving customer satisfaction in Central Texas. Survey results represent the baseline by which to measure expected improvements in customer satisfaction for Central Texas with semi-annual surveys conducted hereafter. Formal plans for continuous improvement and customer satisfaction are not included in this publication; the research described through this document is simply provided as a model which can be used for replication. Any agency beginning a continuous improvement initiative which includes the measure of customer satisfaction, should develop a formal strategic plan with specific objectives identified to reach their goals.

This research report describes the reasoning behind measuring customer satisfaction. Although Central Texas is a One-Stop Pilot site, initial survey was limited to the JTPA program. The survey limitation was necessary because difficulties regarding sharing common customer information and the definition of when an individual becomes a "one-stop customer" are, as yet, unresolved. Additionally, JTPA customers and employees are already involved in performance and customer satisfaction measures. "The Job Training Partnership Act Amendments of August 6, 1992 changed the focus of technical assistance and training from that of a compliance-based system to an activity which enhances service delivery to the customer" (Angel, 1993, p. 1). Further, the Department of Labor is developing an initiative that is intended to include client satisfaction as a standardized performance measure in the JTPA program. As the first step of the initiative, the Department of Labor proposed a "client-centered approach" to service delivery which would include specific "measures of customer satisfaction" in its April 1994 Performance Standards Technical Conference (Dickinson, Means, Conroe, & Belford, 1994, p. 2).

Finally, as an Enterprise Charter Member, the Central Texas SDA supports continuous improvement through Total Quality Management. We believe that, by surveying our customers, we are initiating a means of communication that will facilitate a bottom up approach to improved service delivery. As stated previously, customer satisfaction surveys are but a single component of the Central Texas plan to enhance customer satisfaction through continuous improvement.

P. Linda Angel
August, 1995

Executive Summary

Instrument Used: Five-level, twenty-five question Likert Response Scale

Range: Agree Strongly to Disagree Strongly

Population Surveyed:
All JTPA adult customers (identified as active on July 4, 1994):
Temple Office: 129 participants—79 Title IIA, 59 Title III
Killeen Office: 112 participants—54 Title IIA, 58 Title III
Attempted contact with every member of the population was required.

Acceptable Response Rate:
Total: 181 participants (75%)
Temple Office: 53 Title IIA, 44 Title III
Killeen Office: 41 Title IIA; 43 Title III

Informed Consent: Every member of the population was informed by mail of the reasons for conducting the survey and what could be expected from the results. The letter also verified a participant contact telephone number and designated when the survey would be conducted and by whom.

Units of Measurement:
Each question was assigned a score between 4 and 0 (Strongly agree = 4, Agree = 3, Neutral = 2, Disagree = 1, Strongly Disagree = 0). The twenty-five question scores were added to produce an aggregate score for each survey with "satisfaction scores" ranging between 38-100. The analysis provided 84 scores for the Killeen office and 97 scores for the Temple office.

Analysis:
1. Combined and Individual Average (Mean) Scores by office and case managers
2. Analysis of Variance(ANOVA) between offices and case managers
3. Ranking of questions from least to most positive response by combined and individual offices
4. Item analysis of additional comments by subject

Recommendations:
1. Use results of survey as an administrative tool to increase levels of customer satisfaction through improved program services.
2. Implement a follow-up survey in six months to evaluate improvements.
3. Do correlational study comparing survey results with participant performance outcomes to determine relationship between customer satisfaction and positive outcomes.

Why Measure Customer Satisfaction

Background

The Workforce Development Board of Central Texas (the local Private Industry Council), provides oversight and guidance regarding compliance with Public Law 102-367 "(the Job Training Partnership Act), Federal, State, and local regulations and requirements, service provider contracts, and job training plans" (Beck, 1993, p. 1). Because the Central Texas Council of Governments acts as administrative entity for the Workforce Development Board of Central Texas, and because JTPA is a performance-driven program, proposed changes to current performance standards are of particular concern. The Central Texas Council of Governments is, therefore, in the process of developing a standardized measure of customer satisfaction which includes "customer surveys, focus groups, discussions and informal interviews with customers, complaint procedures and suggestion boxes" (Dickinson, Boober, Farley, & Sosanya, 1994, p. 5). The survey proposed herein, is to be the initial step in determining a base upon which future customer satisfaction can be measured, and the information resulting from the survey will be used as a catalyst for restructuring service delivery in both the Killeen and Temple JTPA offices to provide enhanced service delivery and customer satisfaction to the adult JTPA population.

To begin measuring customer satisfaction, it is necessary to identify the strengths and weaknesses in service delivery for the Central Texas Council of Government's (CTCOG) Employment and Training adult programs. The element of measure will be provided by comparing the Killeen JTPA office client survey results to the Temple JTPA Office client survey results. For the purposes of this study, all adults surveyed within the seven county service delivery area will be receiving services through either the Killeen or Temple field office. The proposed survey expects to compare level of customer satisfaction (the dependent variable) as it relates to service delivery in the Killeen and Temple

JTPA field offices (the independent variables). The study hypothesizes there is no difference in level of customer satisfaction between the two offices. Should differences appear in levels of customer satisfaction possible explanations beyond differences in service delivery could include differences in geographic location; differences in client needs, interests and abilities; or differences in customers' perceived function of the JTPA program.

The JTPA adult program consists of two populations; the Title III program serves dislocated workers and the Title IIA program assists economically disadvantaged adults between the ages of 22 and 54. Both of these programs are performance driven and are, therefore, outcome oriented. Currently, the Title III program has two performance goals: (1) entered employment rate, and (2) average wage at placement, and the Title IIA program has four performance standards: (1) adult follow-up employment rate, (2) adult follow-up weekly earnings, (3) adult welfare follow-up employment rate, and (4) adult welfare follow-up weekly earnings (JTPA Interim Final Rule § 632.89(e), Public Law 102-367). However, the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness proposed and passed the following three additional performance standards for the Title IIA program on May 27, 1994: (1) placement in employment with benefits, (2) serving JOBS participants, and (3) placement in high wage jobs (Workforce Development Board of Central Texas, 1994, p. 16).

Literature Review

The JTPA adult program consists of two populations; the Title III program serves dislocated workers and the Title IIA program assists economically disadvantaged adults between the ages of 22 and 54. Both of these programs are performance driven and are, therefore, outcome oriented. Currently, the Title III program has two performance goals: (1) entered employment rate, and (2) average wage at placement, and the Title IIA program has four performance standards: (1) adult follow-up employment rate, (2) adult follow-up weekly earnings, (3) adult welfare follow-up employment rate, and (4) adult welfare follow-up weekly earnings (JTPA Interim Final Rule § 632.89(e), Public Law 102-367). However, the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness proposed and passed the following three additional performance standards for the Title IIA program on May 27, 1994: (1) placement in employment with benefits, (2) serving JOBS participants, and (3) placement in high wage jobs (Workforce Development Board of Central Texas, 1994, p. 16).

Many proponents of the JTPA program applaud its current performance measures. Richard Sayre (1993) cited Karen Green's (Department of Labor) defense of

> "JTPA's existing performance system as 'unique among federal programs.' JTPA's six standards 'are now totally in sync' with efforts to spur lengthier and more costly interventions. . . . We get constant feedback . . . and we've made adjustments" (p. 669).

However, the "presidential campaign of 1992 ushered in a new era for job training. . . . For the first time in our history, job training was extolled as a major contributor to solving the nations economic ills" (Guttman, 1992, p. 180). Governors are now required to evaluate job training and employment programs in areas including the "ability to deliver job training services effectively, to administer training in accordance with the act, and the portion [not less than 10%] of a labor market served" (Smith, 1992, p. 262).

4 Measuring Customer Satisfaction

Program evaluation is being extended to "fulfilling JTPA's vision of helping economically disadvantaged youth and adults become independent, self-sufficient participants in the workforce and contributing members of society" (Quayle, 1992, p. 116). Sayre (1993) noted Gerald Peterson, Assistant Inspector General, Department of Labor, observation that "JTPA's statement of purpose at Sec. 2 states that job training should result in 'increased employment and earnings, increased education and occupation skills, and decreased welfare dependency'" (p. 668). Smith (1992) quoted Gary Hochlander, director for planning and evaluation for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, in his contention that programs should be evaluated. He proposed, however, that "'Performance standards were not developed to determine national accountability' . . . . Standards are designed to stimulate improvements in local vocational education programs" (p. 249). Vanderford (1992) also supports the need to measure program success in fulfilling the JTPA purpose; however, he believes that investigators should not "start the building process by having high-level systems discussion — [he believed they should] start with honest discussions with clients about their needs (p. 102).

Opponents to the current JTPA program offer various alternative programs for job training and employment. Doug Ross recommends "eliminat[ing] JTPA and other federal job training programs to pay for a new employment insurance system" which would "entitle a laid-off or part-time worker to $1200 in federally paid training over five years" (Clinton Partisan, 1992, p. 268). Smith (1992) cited Garth Magnum, economist and management professor at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, who responded to Ross' proposal by stating "Job training 2000 training and educational vouchers are equivalent to 'shift[ing] the deck chairs on the Titanic'" (p. 278). Another example of proposed program performance measure comes from the National Commission on Employment Policy. The Commission suggests that programs can use "unemployment insurance wage data readily available to them, and be confident they are getting accurate results" (Smith, 1993, p. 963). Smith (1992) also provides an alternate view that advocates benchmarks as a method of program analysis; Smith cites

Gary Hoachlander, director for planning and evaluation for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, who expressed the belief that "'measures are but one tool used to assess the performance of vocational education programs and should not be the sole focus of planned outcomes. Emphasize indicators rather than precise measures'" (p. 250).

Abt Associates proposed a "scientific method" for "comparing outcomes for those receiving JTPA services with a control group that was denied services . . . [so that] 'any subsequent difference in program outcomes between the two groups can confidently be attributed to the program'" (DelPonte, 1993, p. 532). The outcomes of the 10 year study were positive overall. However, some groups of the JTPA population were identified as not helped and/or actually hindered by the program. The Abt study's validity was questioned because it changed its initial program design and tested a population which was not representative of the national JTPA program population. DelPonte (1993) identified Dennis Benson, president of Appropriate Solutions, for his staunch criticism of the Abt study. Benson explained the above flaws in the study and added that "JTPA is a pass/fail system. 'It is not judged by numbers or statistics but by the fears, failures, hopes, dreams and successes of real people. [He suggested] if you really want to know the impact of JTPA, ask the people in the programs'" (p. 533).

Benson's suggestion to "ask the people" met with strong criticism from employment and training professionals. DelPonte (1993) stated that R. Maynard, professor at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia; Laurie Bassi, professor at Georgetown University; and Gary Burtless, senior fellow Brookings Institute in Washington, D. C. "all remarked that Benson's suggestion to 'ask the people in the programs' to find out if JTPA works has merit, but is only [one] piece of the puzzle." Bassi went further to say, "'You don't evaluate a program by talking to participants. Some people may feel good or bad about a program, but talking to them is no way to measure a program's impact;" Maynard also stated, "If Benson advocated talking to clients . . . 'my question is — Is JTPA a feel-good program? Is that what DOL wants.[?] If so asking participants their opinions will provide the answers'" (p. 547).

6 Measuring Customer Satisfaction

For many "the current rational is competitiveness; the almost universally accepted dictum is that we must improve the preparation and training of our workforce to make the American economy competitive in an ever more international economy" (Guttman, 1992, p. 180).

The question of how DOL wants to evaluate the JTPA program was answered in The Gore Report on Reinventing Government (cited in the U.S. Department of Labor Performance Standards Technical Conference, 1994). Al Gore stated "a lot of people don't realize that the federal government has customers. We have customers. The American people" (p. 3). President William J. Clinton's Executive Order (Sept. 11, 1993) reinforced Gore's position in his Executive Order (cited in the U.S. Department of Labor Performance Standards Technical Conference, 1994) stating, "All executive offices and agencies . . . that provide significant services directly to the public shall . . .

- survey customers to determine . . . their level of satisfaction with existing services" (Using Measures, 1994, p. 1-3).

In response to the President's position, many states began developing methods of evaluation which included "a survey of program participants on the level of satisfaction with the programs" for the purpose of examining "possible new directions for the improvement of job training and assistance for economically disadvantaged individuals" (Employment and Training, 1994, p. 25964). Programs of the future are expected to treat "the client as the 'consumer' of services" (K. Dickinson, B. Means, J. Farley, & C. Zavala, 1994, p. 5). Further, employment and training programs are recognized for having "two customers — clients who want services and employers who want trained workers." Customer satisfaction measures are being developed to increase the marketable status of the JTPA program. Steven Golightly, director of the JOBS technology assistance project at the National Alliance of Business, contends that, to the JTPA program, "market research is 'anything that helps an agency identify what the customer wants'" (Sayre, 1992, p. 82).

The Central Texas Council of Governments (CTCOG) strives to maintain the highest standards of employment and training service provision. CTCOG, therefore, supports the position of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The Center explains, "A measure specifies how an outcome will be measured, whereas a standard represents the level against which performance on the measure will be evaluated" (DelPonte, 1993, p. 966). The CTCOG intends to use the outcomes of the proposed customer satisfaction survey to set standards against which future surveys can be compared. The CTCOG will be asking the question, "Is there a disparity in the type of services received between and among program populations?" (DOL Issues, 1993, p. 553). The data are expected to "provide more informed evaluation of the fit between client needs and the distribution of program resources" (NCEP Creates, 1993, p. 617).

Charley (1992) stated "assessment techniques are the key to aligning project goals with project outcomes" (p. 62). To establish and maintain high levels of customer satisfaction, "client-centered assessment, service planning and case management should all be client driven." Further, the customer-centered approach to "ongoing case management" includes contacts with customers to "provide ongoing support and advocacy for" the customer. Finally, because of the potential impact of customer satisfaction on the JTPA program outcomes, "customer feedback needs to be started right from orientation through follow-up. . . .A major component of customer satisfaction is listening to the customer" (K. Dickinson, B. Means, J. Farley, & K. Zavala, 1994, p. 2). Sayre (1993) cited Greg Newton's observation that "assessment is 'a vital program activity' which must increase the odds that clients succeed" (p. 708).

The proposed survey will provide information which will facilitate assessment of: (1) current level of customer satisfaction with service delivery, and (2) what influences customer satisfaction. The data can then be compared to current performance standards to determine whether customer satisfaction can predict future outcomes (Using Measures, 1994, p. 6). "We measure customer satisfaction to: (1) set better goals/services wanted, (2) develop appropriate capacity/services added, and (3) provide oversight and evaluation service outcomes" (K.

Dickinson, C. Sosanya, B. Boober, 1994, p. 1). The U.S. Department of Labor, Training and Employment Division, recommends that JTPA programs "establish a strong customer focus and orientation which results in ever increasing levels of customer satisfaction" (Using Measures, p. 2, 1994). DelPonte (1993) quoted Assistant Secretary of Labor, Doug Ross on his position regarding performance standards: "Performance measures will allow customers to compare one provider with another when deciding where to go for services . . . . Outcomes, program measures, basic values and the right and wrong way to do things are all part of the common mission" (p. 34).

The CTCOG has numerous reasons for developing and implementing a customer satisfaction survey. However, one of the most compelling incentives is the impact initial customer satisfaction surveys will have on employment and training programs nationally. Roy Vanderford (1993), president of the Indianapolis Network for Employment and Training, notes "it is important that survey results get out to law makers and policy gurus because it could have national implications" (p. 675).

Methodology

Overview

This report uses a causal-comparative research model with a systematic sampling population to test the Ho: there is no difference in service delivery as measured by levels of customer satisfaction between the Killeen and Temple JTPA field offices. A Likert scale response instrument is employed to rate customers' opinions regarding service delivery as a determiner of level of customer satisfaction. The survey measures the level of customer satisfaction (the dependent variable) for the customer's assigned field office (the independent variable). The accepted level is .05.

Sample

The JTPA Client Management System (CMS) database identified all active participants between the ages of 22-54 who were enrolled and actively participating in either Title IIA (economically disadvantaged individuals) or Title III (dislocated workers/homemakers) of the JTPA program and who were being provided services through the Killeen or Temple JTPA field offices on July 4, 1994. The CMS produced a total population of 241 active JTPA customers. The Temple JTPA field office serves 129 active participants: 70 Title IIA and 59 Title III enrollees, and the Killeen JTPA field office assists 112 active participants: 54 Title IIA and 58 Title III customers. This population represents adults living within a seven county area of central Texas including Bell, Coryell, Hamilton, Lampasas, Milam, Mills, and San Saba counties. The information produced by the CMS was verified against active client files to ensure every member of the population was identified for the purposes of this customer satisfaction survey.

The results of this survey will not only impact current methods of service delivery, but could also influence legislative decisions related to measures of performance standards. Further, the results of the survey

will be used as a baseline for future studies. Therefore, an attempt to contact all members of the population is required with an acceptable response rate of 75%.

For the identified population, the acceptable response rate equals 181 respondents--84 responses (41 Title IIA and 43 Title III customers) from the Killeen JTPA field office and 97 responses (53 Title IIA and 44 Title III participants) from the Temple JTPA field office. Acceptable responses are defined as responses from active participants of the JTPA program who respond to all components of the survey. To ensure that every member of the population has an equal chance at being contacted, the telephone survey will be conducted during both day and evening hours and on weekdays as well as weekends.

Instrument

The survey instrument is a twenty-five statement, five-level Likert scale with responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Response levels are assigned points as follows: Strongly Agree=4, Agree=3, Neutral=2, Disagree=1, and Strongly Disagree=0;

The instrument also identifies the following: field office, Title IIA/Title III, case manager, currently receiving services, and length of service delivery (see Appendix B). The information obtained beyond the Likert scale responses will verify sampling information and allow evaluation of the data in terms of service delivery not only by population but by grant title within each population (Title IIA or Title III).

Implementation

The first step in initiating the customer satisfaction telephone survey project was introduced by the Central Texas Council of Governments. The CTCOG mailed every member of the identified population a letter introducing the telephone survey, designating when JTPA participants

could expect to be contacted, verifying a participant contact telephone number, introducing a CTCOG contact person, and explaining what can be expected from results of participation (see Appendix A).

Prior to beginning the true observation process, the survey instrument was tested using a small sample of adult JTPA Literacy Grant participants (n=10) to ensure each question required no interpretation on the part of JTPA customers. The telephone survey was then administered to 181 JTPA participants; 84 customers were surveyed from the Killeen field office (41-Title IIA and 43-Title III) and 97 participants were contacted from the Temple field office (53-Title IIA and 44-Title III). The expected 75% acceptable response rate was achieved.

Units of Measurement

To develop interval level data that provides more than a descriptive analysis, each survey response is assigned a value ranging between four and zero. A "satisfaction score" for each survey is determined by adding the response values for that survey. The resulting survey scores range between 38 and 100. The analysis provides 84 scores for the Killeen office and 97 scores for the Temple field office. The responses are also tallied by question to provide a descriptive analysis of the number of responses to each question for the population as a whole and for the Killeen and Temple field offices individually (see Appendix C).

Analytical Method

The survey "satisfaction scores" for each office are evaluated by an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). This allows measurement of variation in survey scores between the responses received from the Killeen and Temple field office customers.

The customer responses were further analyzed using an ANOVA to compare each individual question response between case managers.

The comparison identifies results which demonstrate responses which vary significantly between case managers. (see Appendix D).

Finally, single question means were developed for the combined office responses, and for the Killeen and the Temple field office responses. The mean scores were then used to rank order the questions using a weighted negative/positive response evaluation (see Appendix E).

Comments were received which were not a part of the Likert scale survey. These responses resulted from the statement, "This ends the scaled question part of the survey. However, there is a space provided if you would like to identify any problems you may have or concerns you would like to see addressed. Any statements you make will not be connected with your name." The comments were divided into case manager categories (see Appendix F) and content categories (see Appendix G).

Results

The resulting analysis demonstrated Fobt 6.788 > Fcrit 6.64.

Table of Results

MEASURE	KILLEEN FIELD OFFICE	TEMPLE FIELD OFFICE
Mean	87.31	82.381
Standard Deviation	12.126	13.16
Source of Variation	Between (Treatment)	Within (Error)
Sum of the Squares	1093.272	28828.839
Means Square	1093.272	161.055
Degrees of Freedom	1	179
Total of Sum of Squares		29922.11
ANOVA (F obtained), 1 and 179		6.788*

*Significant at a .01 level

The analysis indicates a significant difference in population characteristics between levels of customer satisfaction in the Killeen and Temple JTPA field offices at a .99 confidence interval (= .01). Therefore, the Ho predicting no difference in level of customer satisfaction between the Killeen and Temple JTPA field offices must be rejected.

Recommendations

Because the data measured in this study are not currently used as measures of performance, the information provided by the descriptive question analysis (Appendix C) can be used as an administrative tool. Areas which appear to be deficient can be improved using capacity building activities which are designed to improve service delivery and thus increase levels of customer satisfaction. The data can also be used as a benchmark for comparison in future studies.

The question of whether customer satisfaction should be employed as a measure of performance cannot be answered by this study. However, a correlational study which compares the data produced by this study with the follow-up data of the customers who participated in the survey would determine the degree of relationship between the surveyed customer's satisfaction and placement in high wage employment with benefits. Should a positive relationship exist between customers' subjective satisfaction and customers' objective outcomes then using customer satisfaction surveys as measures of performance would be warranted. If, however, no significant relationship can be determined, the use of customer satisfaction surveys and customer focus groups should be developed as administrative tools designed to produce improved programs which better meet the needs of the customer.

Further research is warranted in two areas: (1) customer satisfaction surveys should be conducted on an annual basis to identify programmatic deficiencies and areas of service delivery which are detrimental to customers' academic and subsequent employment activities, and (2) correlational studies are necessary to determine the degree of relationship between subjective measures of customer satisfaction and objective measures of employment in high wage jobs with benefits. Customer satisfaction certainly has a place in employment and training programs; however, exactly where that place might be is yet to be determined.

DATE

FIELD(title) FIELD(fname) FIELD(lname)
FIELD(address)
FIELD(city)

Dear FIELD(title) FIELD(lname):

The Central Texas Council of Governments which operates the local JTPA program is in the process of evaluating program services being offered in the Killeen and Temple JTPA field offices. One of the measuring devices being used is a customer satisfaction survey which will be conducted by telephone during July 1994.

As a customer of the JTPA program, we are requesting that you provide honest answers which will help us provide you with the services which will best meet your needs and the needs of future JTPA customers. The survey contains twenty-five statements; we are asking you to rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements. Your opinion of the services being offered will then be used to improve any part of the JTPA program which is not being provided in a satisfactory manner or which is not meeting the needs of its customers. The information you provide will not be used to assess the services of any single case manager.

We are interested in the opinions of our customers and will therefore be contacting you within the next few weeks. If for any reason you cannot be contacted at FIELD(tele) or if you would prefer to call at your convenience, please contact Linda Angel at 1-800-365-JTPA. Welook forward to speaking with you.

Sincerely,

Susan Kamas,
Director, JTPA

SK:la

Appendix | **B.1**

Name: February 1995

Case Manager:
Currently Receiving JTPA Services: YES NO

Title IIA Title III
How Long? ___ Yrs ___ Mos.

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1. The JTPA staff treats me with respect.					
2. The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.					
3. My needs were identified,					
4. I was told about JTPA services that I could use to help me meet my needs.					
5. I was actively involved in choosing the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.					
6. My case manager told me about local job availability while helping me to develop my career plan.					
7. I was given choices.					
8. The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.					
9. I was enrolled in the training I wanted.					
10. I feel the goals outlined in my career plan are attainable.					
11. I feel I am receiving the services I need to reach my goals.					
12. I was told about services I could get from other agencies.					
13. I was encouraged to apply for financial assistance to help me with my living expenses while in training.					
14. My case manager cares what happens to me.					
15. My case manager treats me like I want to be treated.					
16. I feel the JTPA program is helping me to improve my current life situation.					
17. I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.					
18. I am aware of emergency financial assistance available through the JTPA program.					
19. The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.					
20. I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.					
21. I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.					
22. I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.					
23. I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.					
24. I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.					
25. I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.					

Additional Comments:

GRAND TOTAL BOTH OFFICES

Number Surveyed: 181
Average: 84.67

Standard Deviation: 12.86
(66% of all responses ranged between 71.81 and 97.53)

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1. The JTPA staff treats me with respect.	115	59	3	4	
2. The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.	111	64	4	2	
3. My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.	90	82	7	2	
4. I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.	92	78	4	5	2
5. My case manager provided career exploration or counselling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.	63	72	34	10	2
6. I was given choices.	76	77	15	10	3
7. The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.	93	74	9	3	2
8. I was enrolled in the training I wanted.	109	59	7	4	2
9. I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.	102	73	6		
10. I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.	96	77	6	2	
11. I was told about services I could get from other agencies.	47	66	34	29	5
12. I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.	80	75	13	9	4
13. My case manager cares what happens to me.	100	70	5	3	3
14. My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.	97	68	13	2	1
15. My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.	94	71	7	5	4
16. I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.	108	67	6		
17. I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.	105	63	5	4	4
18. I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).	79	72	19	6	5
19. The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.	123	52	5	1	
20. I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.	105	61	15		
21. I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.	101	75	5		
22. I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.	96	78	7		
23. I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.	121	52	5	2	1
24. I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.	77	89	15		
25. I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.	81	65	27	7	1

Appendix | **B.3**

KIILLEEN OFFICE

Number Surveyed: 84
Average: 87.31

Standard Deviation: 12.05
(66% of all responses ranged between 75.26 and 99.36)

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1. The JTPA staff treats me with respect.	62	22			
2. The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.	62	21		1	
3. My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.	46	35	3		
4. I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.	46	36	1	1	
5. My case manager provided career exploration or counselling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.	34	29	16	5	
6. I was given choices.	40	36	5	2	1
7. The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.	50	32	2		
8. I was enrolled in the training I wanted.	52	26	3	3	
9. I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.	51	31	2		
10. I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.	51	30	2	1	
11. I was told about services I could get from other agencies.	30	29	14	8	3
12. I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.	43	30	5	4	2
13. My case manager cares what happens to me.	55	24	4	1	
14. My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.	51	28	5		
15. My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.	50	31	3		
16. I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.	58	26			
17. I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.	55	27	1		1
18. I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).	42	27	12	1	2
19. The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.	60	21	2	1	
20. I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.	51	28	5		
21. I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.	53	28	3		
22. I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.	49	30	5		
23. I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.	60	21	3		
24. I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.	45	35	4		
25. I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.	42	27	10	4	1

TEMPLE OFFICE

Number Surveyed: 97
Average: 82.38

Standard Deviation: 13.09
(66% of all responses ranged between 69.29 and 95.47)

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1. The JTPA staff treats me with respect.	53	37	3	4	
2. The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.	49	43	4	1	
3. My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.	44	47	4	2	
4. I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.	46	42	3	4	2
5. My case manager provided career exploration or counselling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.	29	43	18	5	2
6. I was given choices.	36	41	10	8	2
7. The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.	43	42	7	3	2
8. I was enrolled in the training I wanted.	57	33	4	1	2
9. I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.	51	42	4		
10. I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.	45	47	4	1	
11. I was told about services I could get from other agencies.	17	37	20	21	2
12. I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.	37	45	8	5	2
13. My case manager cares what happens to me.	45	46	1	2	3
14. My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.	46	40	8	2	1
15. My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.	44	40	4	5	4
16. I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.	50	41	6		
17. I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.	50	36	4	4	3
18. I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).	37	45	7	5	3
19. The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.	63	31	3		
20. I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.	54	33	10		
21. I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.	48	47	2		
22. I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.	47	48	2		
23. I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.	61	31	2	2	1
24. I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.	32	54	11		
25. I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.	39	38	17	3	

Appendix | C.1

Grand Total Both Offices

Number Surveyed: 181
Average: 84.67

Standard Deviation: 12.86
(66% of all responses ranged between 71.81 and 97.53)

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

	QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1.	The JTPA staff treats me with respect.	115	59	3	4	
2.	The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.	111	64	4	2	
3.	My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.	90	82	7	2	
4.	I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.	92	78	4	5	2
5.	My case manager provided career exploration or counselling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.	63	72	34	10	2
6.	I was given choices.	76	77	15	10	3
7.	The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.	93	74	9	3	2
8.	I was enrolled in the training I wanted.	109	59	7	4	2
9.	I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.	102	73	6		
10.	I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.	96	77	6	2	
11.	I was told about services I could get from other agencies.	47	66	34	29	5
12.	I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.	80	75	13	9	4
13.	My case manager cares what happens to me.	100	70	5	3	3
14.	My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.	97	68	13	2	1
15.	My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.	94	71	7	5	4
16.	I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.	108	67	6		
17.	I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.	105	63	5	4	4
18.	I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).	79	72	19	6	5
19.	The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.	123	52	5	1	
20.	I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.	105	61	15		
21.	I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.	101	75	5		
22.	I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.	96	78	7		
23.	I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.	121	52	5	2	1
24.	I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.	77	89	15		
25.	I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.	81	65	27	7	1

Killeen Office

Number Surveyed: 84
Average: 87.31

Standard Deviation: 12.05
(66% of all responses ranged between 75.26 and 99.36)

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

	QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1.	The JTPA staff treats me with respect.	62	22			
2.	The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.	62	21		1	
3.	My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.	46	35	3		
4.	I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.	46	36	1	1	
5.	My case manager provided career exploration or counselling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.	34	29	16	5	
6.	I was given choices.	40	36	5	2	1
7.	The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.	50	32	2		
8.	I was enrolled in the training I wanted.	52	26	3	3	
9.	I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.	51	31	2		
10.	I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.	51	30	2	1	
11.	I was told about services I could get from other agencies.	30	29	14	8	3
12.	I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.	43	30	5	4	2
13.	My case manager cares what happens to me.	55	24	4	1	
14.	My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.	51	28	5		
15.	My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.	50	31	3		
16.	I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.	58	26			
17.	I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.	55	27	1		1
18.	I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).	42	27	12	1	2
19.	The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.	60	21	2	1	
20.	I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.	51	28	5		
21.	I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.	53	28	3		
22.	I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.	49	30	5		
23.	I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.	60	21	3		
24.	I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.	45	35	4		
25.	I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.	42	27	10	4	1

Appendix | **C.3**

Temple Office

Number Surveyed: 97
Average: 82.38

Standard Deviation: 13.09
(66% of all responses ranged between 69.29 and 95.47)

AS = Agree Strongly; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; DS = Disagree Strongly

	QUESTION	AS	A	N	D	DS
1.	The JTPA staff treats me with respect.	53	37	3	4	
2.	The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.	49	43	4	1	
3.	My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.	44	47	4	2	
4.	I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.	46	42	3	4	2
5.	My case manager provided career exploration or counselling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.	29	43	18	5	2
6.	I was given choices.	36	41	10	8	2
7.	The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.	43	42	7	3	2
8.	I was enrolled in the training I wanted.	57	33	4	1	2
9.	I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.	51	42	4		
10.	I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.	45	47	4	1	
11.	I was told about services I could get from other agencies.	17	37	20	21	2
12.	I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.	37	45	8	5	2
13.	My case manager cares what happens to me.	45	46	1	2	3
14.	My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.	46	40	8	2	1
15.	My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.	44	40	4	5	4
16.	I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.	50	41	6		
17.	I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.	50	36	4	4	3
18.	I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).	37	45	7	5	3
19.	The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.	63	31	3		
20.	I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.	54	33	10		
21.	I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.	48	47	2		
22.	I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.	47	48	2		
23.	I believe that tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.	61	31	2	2	1
24.	I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.	32	54	11		
25.	I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.	39	38	17	3	

Case Manager Averages by Question and Analysis of Variance Between Case Managers

(Specific case manager information not provided as part of this publication)

Appendix | **E.1**

Rank Ordered Questions for Both Offices

(listed from most to least favorably weighted response)

- The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.
- I believe tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services
- The JTPA staff treats me with respect.
- The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.
- I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.
- I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.
- I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.
- I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.
- I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.
- I was enrolled in the training I wanted.
- I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.
- I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.
- My case manager cares what happens to me.
- My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.
- My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.
- The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.
- I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.
- My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.
- I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.
- I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.
- I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.
- I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).
- I was given choices.
- My case manager provided career exploration or counseling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.
- I was told about services I could get from other agencies.

Rank Ordered Questions for Killeen Field Office

(listed from most to least favorably weighted response)

- The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.
- I believe tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services
- The JTPA staff treats me with respect.
- The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.
- I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.
- I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.
- I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.
- I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.
- I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.
- I was enrolled in the training I wanted.
- I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.
- I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.
- My case manager cares what happens to me.
- My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.
- My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.
- The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.
- I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.
- My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.
- I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.
- I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.
- I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.
- I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).
- I was given choices.
- My case manager provided career exploration or counseling about local job availability. while helping me to develop my service strategy.
- I was told about services I could get from other agencies.

Appendix **E.3**

Rank Ordered Questions for Temple Field Office

(listed from most to least favorably weighted response)

- I was told about services I could get from other agencies.
- My case manager provided career exploration or counseling about local job availability while helping me to develop my service strategy.
- I was given choices.
- I am receiving support services through the JTPA program (if needed).
- I was encouraged to apply for financial aid to help me with my living expenses while in training.
- I cannot get the services I receive from JTPA through another agency.
- My case manager treats me in a manner which helps to improve my self-esteem.
- I feel my input about JTPA program services will be used to improve the local JTPA program.
- The JTPA staff listens to me about what I want.
- I was actively involved in determining the activities I would participate in to reach my goals.
- I feel I can contact my case manager to discuss any problems which may stop me from reaching my goals.
- My case manager encourages my attempts to improve my life situation.
- My case manager cares what happens to me.
- My needs were assessed and related services available to me through JTPA were discussed.
- I feel the services I am receiving are appropriate with the goals identified in my service strategy.
- The JTPA staff treats me with respect.
- The JTPA staff acts in a professional and friendly manner.
- I feel I will succeed in meeting my goals with the continued support of the JTPA program.
- I feel the JTPA program is helping me to become independent and self-sufficient.
- I was enrolled in the training I wanted.
- I feel the JTPA program will help me compete effectively in the local job market.
- I find the JTPA program and staff helpful.
- I feel the goals outlined in my service strategy are attainable.
- I believe tax dollars are well spent on JTPA services.
- The training I am receiving is improving my chances for employment in the field I have chosen.

Content Analysis:
Case Manager Specific Comments

(Specific case manager information not provided as part of this publication)

Appendix | G.1

Content Analysis: Policy and Training Institution Specific Comments

(Specific comments regarding training institutions and policies not provided as part of this publication)